

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 STEVEN K. YOUNG,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 DITECH FINANCIAL, LLC, et al.,

14 Defendants.

CASE NO. C19-0867JLR

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

15 On September 3, 2019, the court ordered *pro se* Plaintiff Steven K. Young to show
16 cause for the second time why this case should not be dismissed for lack of subject matter
17 jurisdiction. (*See* 2d OSC (Dkt. # 23) at 1 (citing 1st OSC (Dkt. # 10)).) Specifically, the
18 court ordered Mr. Young to file a written response that:

19 (a) asserts the citizenship of each member of Ditech [Financial LLC
20 (“Ditech”)], and if any member of Ditech is itself a limited liability company,
21 each of that company’s members, until each layer of limited liability
22 company membership is reduced to the individual members; and (b) asserts
specific facts from which the court can determine whether Mr. Young’s
claim falls under 15 U.S.C. Section 1692e.

1 (*Id.* at 4.) The court cautioned Mr. Young that if he “fails to show cause once again, the
2 court will dismiss his complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.” (*Id.* (citing Fed.
3 R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3); *Rosales v. United States*, 824 F.2d 799, 803 n.4 (9th Cir. 1987)).)

4 Mr. Young responded on September 16, 2019. (2d OSC Resp. (Dkt. # 24).) His
5 response failed to assert “the citizenship of each member of Ditech.” (*See* 2d OSC at 4);
6 *see also Johnson v. Columbia Properties Anchorage, LP*, 437 F.3d 894, 899 (9th Cir.
7 2006) (“We therefore join our sister circuits and hold that, like a partnership, an LLC is a
8 citizen of every state of which its **owners/members** are citizens.”) (emphasis added).

9 Mr. Young also failed to assert “specific facts from which the court can determine
10 whether Mr. Young’s claim falls under 15 U.S.C. Section 1692e.” (*See* 2d OSC at 4.)

11 Notwithstanding Mr. Young’s repeated failures to properly assert subject matter
12 jurisdiction, the court afforded Mr. Young a fourth opportunity and ordered him to file a
13 written response that (1) asserts the citizenship of each and every Ditech member, and
14 (2) alleges specific facts establishing that his purported Fair Debt Collection Practices
15 Act claim arises under 15 U.S.C. § 1692e. (*See* 3d OSC (Dkt. # 25) at 3-4.) The court
16 cautioned Mr. Young that if he fails to establish subject matter jurisdiction after what will
17 now be Mr. Young’s fourth opportunity, the court will dismiss his complaint for lack of
18 subject matter jurisdiction. (*See id.* at 4.)

19 Mr. Young’s response to the court’s order to show cause was due November 22,

20 //

21 //

22 //

1 2019. Mr. Young failed to file a written response. (*See generally* Dkt.) Accordingly, the
2 court DISMISSES this case without prejudice.

3 Dated this 10th day of December, 2019.

4
5 

6 JAMES L. ROBART
7 United States District Judge
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22